



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**Extraterritorial Taxation.**—*Robinson v. Norfolk*, II Va. Appeals 25, decides that § 1032 of the Code, authorizing a city to levy upon a circus exhibiting beyond its territorial limits a license tax for the sole purpose of raising revenue to defray the general expenses of such city, is unlawful. The court—Harrison, J., delivering the opinion—draws a clear-cut distinction between the police power and power of taxation.

---

**Mistake of Law.**—In the case of *Burton v. Haden*, II Va. Appeals 52—March 12th, 1908—our Supreme Court draws the distinction between a mistake of general law and a mistake when the "Jus" is a private right. Here a grantor conveyed an entire interest in land under a mistaken impression that her interest was only one third, which mistake was shared in by the grantee. Upon a bill filed to correct and annul this conveyance, the court says in affirming the decision of the lower court setting the deed aside, "The general doctrine embodied in the maxim 'Ignorantia juris non excusat,' is confined to mistakes of the general rules of law and has no application to the mistakes of persons as to their own private legal rights and interests."

---

**Removal of Fixtures on Sale of Property.**—In *Brunswick Construction Co. v. Burden*, 101 New York Supplement 716, defendant sold his dwelling house to plaintiff on condition that he might "remove all fixtures attached to said premises." He subsequently carried away mantels and hinges, made to match the furniture, and parquet flooring laid over a permanent floor. In an action brought for damages to the freehold, the New York Supreme Court held that they were not distinctively realty, and refused to grant any relief. And this would seem also to be the rule in Virginia, from the dictum of Judge Christian in *Green v. Phillips*, 26 Gratt. 752, 21 Am. Rep. 323, in which he said: "Mirrors, wardrobes, and other heavy articles of furniture, though fastened to the walls by screws with considerable firmness, must be regarded as chattels."

---

**Conversation over Telephone.**—The admissibility in evidence of a telephone conversation was considered in *Holzhauser v. Sheeny*, 104 Southwestern Reporter 1034. The attorney for plaintiff, having ascertained defendant's number from the telephone directory, called up and conversed with her. It was not shown that he knew her voice or that he asked her name. The Kentucky Court of Appeals held that the subject of the conversation and the circumstances of defendant's answering at the number of her address were sufficient identification to charge her as being the person with whom the conversation was had.

In an article in 13 Va. Law Reg. 668, the danger of admitting in